



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO ASSYRIOLOGY.

BY W. MUSS-ARNOLT,
Belmont, Mass.

M. Jules Oppert, the distinguished Paris academician and the last of the three great founders of Assyriology, died at Paris, August 21, 1905, just eighty years of age. To the very last days of his busy life he had carried on his researches with the same energy, perseverance, and successful ingenuity which in his earlier years enabled him to outstrip many of his fellow-workers.¹ The chair of Assyriology at the Collège de France, which he had occupied since 1869, had been especially created for him; it is one of the few chairs, in Europe as well as in America, whose occupant can devote himself exclusively to the study of Assyriology.

Oppert founded a school which has numbered as its members many of the well-known French Assyriologists, one of whom, Dr. Charles Fossey, has just been appointed successor to the great master. It is, therefore, with increased interest that we view each new publication of the young scholar upon whose shoulders the mantle of the departed master has fallen.

Fossey's *La magie assyrienne*, which was crowned by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, and obtained for its author the Prix Saintour, has been reviewed in this *Journal*² by Professor J. Dyneley Prince, who called it "a most interesting attempt to translate a number of extremely difficult and obscure inscriptions," and who states that "The book merits a place of honor in every Assyriological library."

In the year 1904, Fossey began the publication of his *Manuel d'assyriologie*,³ which in nine stately volumes proposes to present both to the Assyriologist and to the general student of Semitic languages, literature, and history a survey of all that should interest them, and is most useful for an intelligent appreciation of the achievements of the researches of the past fifty years along Assyrio-

¹ See the reviewer's article, "The Works of Jules Oppert," published in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Vol. II, pp. 523-56.

² Vol. XIX, April, 1903, pp. 184-87.

³ Charles Fossey, *Manuel d'assyriologie*. Tome Premier: "Explorations et fouilles, déchiffrement des cunéiformes; Origine et histoire de l'écriture." Contenant trois plans et une carte. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1904. Pp. xvi+470. Fr. 25.

logical lines.⁴ Vol. I contains material which has been admirably and most exhaustively treated by many scholars, so that Fossey had a good foundation upon which to rear his own structure. In three divisions he describes **1.** The "Explorations and Discoveries," pp. 1-80; **2.** "The Development of the Cuneiform Inscriptions," pp. 81-244; and **3.** "The Origin and History of the Cuneiform Writing," pp. 245-390. Book I is divided into five chapters, of which the initial contains a brief description of Chaldea, Elam, and Assyria; chaps. 2-4, the history of the explorations and discoveries; and chap. 5, the principal Assyro-Babylonian eprigraphical monuments, classified according to the place where they had been discovered and indicating also where they are found published. This last chapter is a most useful summary. Book II gives in four chapters the history of the decipherment of the Persian, Susian, and Assyro-Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions, and closes with a fifth chapter containing a critical estimate of the results and achievements on the part of Assyriologists. These two books, to be sure, contain very little new material, the author traversing so well-trodden ground that to pick out something new appears almost a hopeless task. Most welcome is the list of the Persian cuneiform alphabet, with the name of the scholar who first determined each character and the date. With Book III the author enters upon a field where he had not so many predecessors. Again in five chapters he takes up (1) the ideographic origin of the cuneiform writing and its subsequent development; (2) the Sumerian origin of the Babylonian writing, chaps. 2-4, of which 3 and 4 are exclusively devoted to a critical estimate and refutation of the views of Halévy, the learned defender of the Semitic origin of the cuneiform writing. The closing chapter treats of the Babylonian origin of the Susian and Persian alphabets. Pp. 393-446 contain a well-selected bibliography on the three subjects treated in the first volume; followed by a careful alphabetical index, pp. 449-65, and an explanation by M. J. Lesquier of the map and the three plans, pp. 469, 470. The whole book is well done, giving a convenient summary for the general reader of matters known, of course, to the professional Assyriologist.⁵ It will

⁴ Vols. II-IX are to treat the following topics: II, "The Souras, including *monuments écrits et monuments figurés*;" III, "The Sumerian and Assyrian Languages;" IV, "Geography of Western Asia on the Basis of the Cuneiform Documents;" V, "History;" VI, "Religion;" VII, "Legal and Contract Literature;" VIII, "Epistolary Literature, Arts and Sciences, Metrology;" IX, "Babylonian Influences."

⁵ P. 276. In discussing the colophon of II Rawl., p. 36, No. 1, Fossey reads GIŠ-ZU-MEŠ as *talmedi*. This seems quite impossible.

be in the succeeding volumes that the author will have ample opportunity to exhibit that breadth of learning and accuracy of scholarship of which we know him to be the fortunate possessor.

Brünnow's well-known and useful *Classified List of All Simple and Compound Cuneiform Ideographs Occurring in the Texts Hitherto* (1889) *Published*, etc., and the same author's *Indices* to this List, published in 1897, as well as Father Strassmaier's *Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der assyrischen und akkadischen Wörter*, etc., are standard publications that will never be antiquated or become useless. The work which these two scholars have done so well will be their authors' *monumentum aere perennius*. But inasmuch as Assyriology is a living science, developing more and more from year to year, increasing continually the bulk of its literature by new discoveries and first editions of texts hitherto unknown or inaccessible, it is but natural that the fine example set by Brünnow, especially, should be followed by others. The two French Assyriologists, Fossey and Virolleaud, have of late contributed such continuations which, as they treat texts not included in Brünnow's book, constitute most welcome supplements. In 1903 M. Virolleaud, professor of Assyriology in the University of Lyon, France, brought out a *Premier supplément à la liste des signes cunéiformes de Bruennow* (Paris: Welter; v+78 pages), based chiefly on the material contained in the bilingual hymns published by Geo. Reisner. The book assumes on the part of its peruser an acquaintance with Brünnow's volume. Whether a second supplement will appear, we know not; especially now that the first half of Fossey's *Contribution*⁶ has been published, including the most important bilingual literary documents published since 1889. The arrangement and order of signs is that of Brünnow. The 192 pages of this first half represent the continuation of pp. 1-258 of Brünnow's, whose page, in addition, contains on the average ten lines more (thirty-eight) as against Fossey's (twenty-eight), the writing also being more compact, so that we can safely estimate that one of Brünnow's pages averages about two pages of Fossey's. Fossey, of course, only mentions the new values for the signs discovered and determined since 1889, assuming that the peruser of his book will have at hand that of his pre-

⁶ *Contributions au Dictionnaire Sumérien-Assyrien. Supplément à la "Classified List" de Brünnow. Fasc. Premier. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905. Fr. 20. The second half is announced as in the press. In a note, dated April 18, 1906, Virolleaud states that no second fascicle of his supplement will be published.*

decessor's also. To the lexicographer this book, as well as that of Virolleaud, will be fully as welcome as that of Brünnow, especially when the second half of Fossey's, containing also preface and indices, is before us, which we hope will be within a short time. No one that owns a copy of Brünnow will want to be without this latest contribution of Jules Oppert's successor. We trust that the second half will exhibit those features the lack of which in Virolleaud's *Supplément* Fossey lamented on pp. 20, 21 of his excellent annual survey of Assyriological work in 1903.⁷ As a side issue—or precursor—of this *Contribution* may be considered the author's *Études sumériennes* (25 pp.) published in 1905.⁸ Another supplement to Brünnow's *Classified List* has just been announced, which will be fully as important as those of Virolleaud and Fossey. Bruno Meissner, the well-known author of the *Supplement zu den assyrischen Wörterbüchern*,⁹ is just publishing the first fascicle, of eighty pages, of *Seltene assyrische Ideogramme*.¹⁰ The book will contain about 280 pages, and its completion is promised within a year after the appearance of Part I. We shall certainly welcome this latest supplement, and hope, when both Fossey and Meissner are completed, to review in detail these three supplements in a future number of this *Journal*.

It was but natural to expect that the author of the *Magie assyrienne* would publish also and explain some of the texts which he had studied for that purpose, and so we find a number of texts discussed in recent volumes of Maspéro's *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, which are now gathered into one volume and published, in 1904, as *Nouveaux textes magiques assyriens: transcription, traduction et commentaire*. And in November, 1905, appeared his *Textes assyriens et babyloniens relatifs à la divination: transcripts, traduits et commentés; I^e série: Šumma ŠA-TAB*,¹¹ the text itself being published in the *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*, Part XX, pp. 31–33 (119 lines of well-preserved text), and pp. 34–37 (four columns of 28,

⁷ *L'assyriologie en 1903*. Par M. Charles Fossey. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1904. Pp. 70. Reprinted from the *Journal asiatique*, September-October, 1904.

⁸ Reprinted from the same journal, January-February, 1905. Fr. 2.50.

⁹ I. e., the dictionaries of Delitzsch and of Muss-Arnolt. See Professor Robert F. Harper's review in this *Journal*, Vol. XIV, pp. 177–82.

¹⁰ This supplement will contain some six thousand entries, about the same number as Fossey's. It is published by the J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung at Leipzig.

¹¹ Paris: *Geuthner*. Pp. viii + 51. Fr. 6, net.

19, 29, and 32 lines, respectively, more or less mutilated). For the Assyrian dictionary these texts yield a few words hitherto not registered, or explained faultily. These will all be incorporated in the reviewer's supplemental volume to his *Concise Dictionary* (=CD.) of the Assyrian Language. The series is called Šumma ŠA-TAB from the first words of the text, ŠA-TAB being the word of which both texts are treating. The author explains the ideogram as meaning something like "kidneys" (pp. 36-38).

Professor Virolleaud is another of those younger French scholars of whom we may expect much good work in the near future. His *L'astrologie chaldéenne*, of which Parts 5, 6, 7, and 8 have appeared, falls into four sections given to texts relating to Sin (the moon), Šamaš (the sun), Ištar (the planets and the stars), and to Adad (the atmosphere). The work is to be completed in thirteen fascicles, of which Parts 1-4 shall contain the cuneiform texts; Parts 5-8, the transliterations; Parts 9-12, the translations; and Part 13, the introduction and glossary. Apparently no commentary will be provided for; though the texts imperatively call for one. The author has, for the first time, classified methodically the fragments published by Craig and Boissier. As soon as the author has published the first four parts we shall be better able to judge of the correctness of his transliterations. To judge, even now, from the character of other publications of Virolleaud's, we may expect to find the same degree of accuracy and painstaking care which he has shown thus far.¹²

Almost simultaneously with Fossey's *Contribution* appeared

¹²M. Virolleaud has published also the following: *Comptabilité chaldéenne: époque de la dynastie dite "seconde d'Our;"* transcrit et traduite; 2 parties (Portiers, 1903); pp. 139; being 76 documents from Tell Loh, copied by the editor in Constantinople, but without publication of the texts. They relate to business transactions, sale of grain, of cattle, of wool, etc., wages of servants and artisans, offerings and sacrifices to Gods.—Di.Tilla: *Textes juridiques chaldéens de la seconde dynastie d'Our;* transcrits et traduits; *ibid.*, 1903; pp. iii+39.—*Études de divination chaldéenne*: I: "Extraits des séries alu et maṣu;" transcription (Paris: Welter, 1904).—*Fragments de textes divinatoires assyriens du Musée britannique* (London: Harrison, 1903); pp. 20.—*Études sur l'astrologie chaldéenne* (Poitiers, 1904); pp. 16.—Also a number of excellent contributions along lexicographical and astrological lines in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, the *Revue sémitique*, etc. It may be well to state that Parts 5-8 of *L'astrologie chaldéenne* were published in autograph by Welter, Paris, 1903; and that Part 6: *Šamash* was also published in printed form by Geuthner, Paris, 1903. A revised manuscript of fascicles 1-8 is now in the hands of an American editor ready to be incorporated into a series now in progress of publication. We also call attention to the appearance of a new French Assyriological journal, *Babyloniaca*, edited by Virolleaud, of which part 1, 50 pp. (Paris: Geuthner, 1906) has appeared. Professor Virolleaud has most generously placed at the reviewer's disposal new lexicographical material from astronomical and astrological texts which he has made his special study for years. This material, most valuable and registering a number of new words hitherto not found in any Assyrian dictionary, will be published in the reviewer's supplemental volume to his dictionary.

the first instalment of Professor Prince's new book.¹³ The reviewer has seldom read an Assyriological publication whose tone, spirit, and candor have impressed him so favorably as this latest book of the Assyriologist of Columbia University, in which he sets out "to solve some of the many problems which have vexed the Assyriological world since the first recognition of the existence in the Assyro-Babylonian inscriptions of an idiom which is clearly not Semitic." Like Fossey, Prince is an ardent opponent of Halévy and his school; but he is much more yielding in unessentials than Fossey has shown himself in his first volume of the *Manuel d'assyriologie*. Prince sets forth the theory that "the Sumerian of later days, especially of the hymns, is a more or less deliberately constructed hodge-podge of Semitic inventions superimposed on what could only have been a non-Semitic agglutinative, almost polysynthetic, language;" and he hopes "that this will go a long way toward setting at rest the argumentation of the constantly decreasing Halévyan school."

The introduction of thirty-four pages contains two chapters: (1) "The Vocabulary and Phonetic System of Sumerian;"¹⁴ and (2) "The Sumerian Pronominal and Verbal Systems."¹⁵ In the arrangement of the *Materials* published here the author has the order followed by Brünnow, pp. 574-88 of his *Classified List*. Prince's book is not a mere list of bilingual words, but a scientific, running discussion on the basis of the author's previous work and the results obtained by his predecessors. It is his endeavor to bring forth as clearly as possible the special development from the primitive idea attached to the original ideograms. Once in a while the process of reasoning strikes the reader as rather fanciful or a little far-fetched; but not often is this the case. It would have helped the reader greatly if Prince had numbered consecutively the different sections from beginning to end, as Brünnow has done in his book. What impresses one most

¹³ *Materials for a Sumerian Lexicon*. With a Grammatical Introduction. By John Dyneley Prince, Ph. D., Professor of Semitic Languages in Columbia University, New York. Part I: Containing the letters A-E. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905. Pp. xxxvi + 109, 4to. M. 24 = *Assyriologische Bibliothek*, herausgegeben von Friedrich Delitzsch und Paul Haupt, Band XIX, Heft 1.

¹⁴ Being, on the whole, a reprint of the author's article in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. XXV (1904), pp. 49-67.

¹⁵ A verbatim reprint of the author's article in this JOURNAL, "The First and Second Persons in Sumerian," Vol. XIX, pp. 203-39. A few minor corrections are offered here: § 15, l. 2 read *ka ša-ma*; l. 4: IV², 10, 7b, reads *ap-ta]-na-ši-il*; § 46, l. 1, read IV⁴, 19, 49a. On the other hand, § 16 the reading *ša[-a-d-da-ku]* in II. 16 c 36, is very good inde d.

favorably is the author's candid statement, so often met, "I cannot explain this." On the other hand, we believe that the author attributes too high a degree of culture and philological witticism to the "coiners" of the later Sumerian hodge-podge who reveled in the use of puns and paronomasia. I wonder whether, indeed, this is the true explanation of the many strange phenomena in the Sumero-Assyrian vocabulary. Perhaps the author will explain this more at length in later parts of his lexicon, which we sincerely hope will be completed before many months. In a work of this kind, undertaken and carried through by a single man, errors and minute corrigenda are necessarily to be expected. The author intends his *Materials* only to be a nucleus around which further investigations may be made, much as Brünnow's work has been. At the same time it will be most useful to the student of Sumerian.

Fault has been found with the work because in it the author has not incorporated all the material in the volumes of the British Museum's publication *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*. But here, again, it should be noticed that Professor Prince does not venture to call his work a *Lexicon*, but merely *Materials* for a lexicon; and, on p. iv of his "Introduction," he distinctly states that this is only "an attempt at an explanation of the Sumerian problem." Nowhere does he claim to have made or to have tried to make a complete lexicon in any sense of the word. If viewed in this light as a pioneer effort to break the road toward a better understanding of the complexities of the Sumerian question, Prince's *Materials* ought to be a most useful work not only to the student beginning his work in Sumerian, but also to the scholar who may wish to compile a fuller word-list and to make a more exhaustive grammatical investigation. It seems hardly just to criticise a work for not being what the author never intended it should be.

The reviewer has read with unvarying interest and admiration this suggestive contribution, and he hopes that the author may deem at least a few of the following remarks and suggestions as worthy of a place in his list of "Addenda et Corrigenda."

A, pp. 1-46.

2, 8/9 read: V 29 g 44 za-gi-in-du-ru; V 22 a-b 11 za-gi-in-du-ur | ^{aban} za-gin-a (= dur).—8, 20/21 šaḥulum not şuḥulum (✓eḥelu?).—Instead of ša-u-a we must evidently read

ša (= *i. e.*) u-a; so against my own *Dictionary*, p. 995, col. 2.—**14**, 9/10 Whether tabînu really means “a strong wall” is rather doubtful; see *CD.*, p. 1145, col. 2. It appears as a synonym of rîtu, “pasture.”—The explanation of kab(p)duqqu: “a ceremonial vessel intended to be held in the left hand,” is very plausible and reasonable, the best yet offered.—**15**, 20/21 Why mazâdu, $\sqrt{zâdu}$ = 𐎶𐎵, “boil, cook,” instead of maçâdu, $\sqrt{\text{çâdu}}$, 𐎶𐎵𐎶; and why qinûnu, instead of kinûnu? Maçâdu, “brilliance” I believe is also found in K 620 = Harper, *BAL.*, No. 91 where ma-ça-su-šu-nu dam-qa-at a-dan-niš is said of mirrors (l. 5); perhaps a mistake of editor for ma-ça-du-šu-nu or of scribe for ma-ça-s(>dš)u-nu.—**16**, 4 instead of K 50 read better K 56 and see Haupt, *ZK.*, Vol. II, p. 456.—**17**, 1/2 Jensen’s translation “Süsswasserocean” for apsû is no doubt based on the antithesis of apsû and tiâmtu, which he derives from 𐎶𐎶𐎶 = 𐎶𐎶𐎶, “stink,” *i. e.* “saltish water.” See also Zimmern in *KAT.*³, pp. 491, 492; 498, etc. It is thus only an applied, not an etymological meaning.—**20**, 2 and **88**, 9 Which is correct, aršašû or upšašû? (Jensen, Zimmern, *et al.*) If the latter, then the author’s reasoning is wrong.—12 read II (not III) 27, 57*g*; the Assyrian equivalent is xu-up-pu-u ša G1 (= qanî).—On gulibat šaxati see now the German edition of Jastrow’s *Religion*, Vol. I, p. 369.—**21** (below) I doubt very much the reading ša-la-am a-bu-bi. The frequent occurrence of ša la-am a-bu-bi makes Prince’s reading improbable.—**22**, 11 mēšaru not mēsarû.—**24**, 8/9 see also *CD.*, p. 897, col. 2, note to çirtu.—**25**, **26** The etymology proposed for axulap is quite novel; but I doubt whether it is preferable to that proposed by Hommel, *PSBA.*, Vol. XIX, p. 315.—**26** (below). I do not believe that a-a-ār (GUŠKIN and KUBABBAR) is Sumerian, rather than pure Semitic. See also K 11424 (*Brit. Texts*, Vol. XIV, pl. 35) ll. 2, 3 (^{šam}) nu-ça-[bu] followed by 4-7 (^{šam}) a-a-ar (xurâçi).—**28**, A-LAL. I take na-ça-bu in II 33 *d* 4-6 to be a noun (>naççabu) rather than a verb. Prince’s combination of it with naçabu, “collect” is very good. See naçabu, 2 (*CD.*, p. 714, col. 1).—**29**, If algamišu is Semitic, it has no place in this list.—Alluxappu I take to mean properly: “a large sack,” such as a “grain sack” = šaqqu ša šeim. As such it was also used for catching or snaring; hence the derived meaning of “net, snare,” *e. g.*, K 9875 III, sect. 3, ll. 12 f. kima al-lu-xap-pu ta-sax-xa-pa-nin-ni, “like

a net you have cast me down.”—**30** (below). In the case of ri-i-bu I would suggest either a mistake on the part of the scribe of *-bu* for *-mu*; or that *-bu* was = *yu* = *mu*. It would thus be properly *rīmu*, $\sqrt{\text{𐤠𐤎𐤁}}$.—**32** (end) IV 3 a 41 su-ru-us-su. The parallel text reads šu-ru-us-su = šuruš-šu > šuršu. See also Thompson, *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, Vol. II, pp. 68, 69.—**34**, An-ta-šub-ba. See especially Zimmern, *Ritualtafeln*, p. 152, No. 45, l. 5 and rem., a reference which our author would have done well to mention.—**35**, An-ta-šur-ra. See also *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), pp. 449; 468, 469.—A-nun-na-ge. See in addition, *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), pp. 497, 548, and 566; and, especially, Hrozný, *Sumerisch-Babyl. Mythen von dem Gotte Ninrag*, pp. 84–89, according to whom they are the black-cloud gods, *i. e.*, the clouds charged with rain surrounding (embracing) the earth.—**36**, (end) II 26 a-b 4 I read a-a]-ar (see ll. 5, 6) | il-lu-rum and consider a’ar a *c.st.* of Semitic a’āru, āru, “flower, blossom, sprout” (𐤀𐤁𐤓).—**38**, 1 On the ideogram of xaltappānu see now *Gött. gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1904, p. 743.—**39**, 5/6 The author’s statement: “The word has nothing to do with 𐤀𐤁𐤓, so Muss-Arnolt,” is somewhat misleading. I have never advocated such an etymology (see *CD.*, p. 101, col. 2, note).—**44**, 5/6 a-ṭir-ti (a-ru) etc., is Semitic as I shall show in my supplemental volume.—10 ff. I cannot agree to Prince’s treatment of as(š)akku; but reserve further discussion for another time.

B, pp. 46–67.

47, Prince’s explanation of bantu V 37 c 48 is very good indeed, much better than the one proposed, *e. g.*, in my own *Dictionary*, p. 175, col. 1.—**48**, 4 (from below), read 7791 not 7761. Instead of of Rammān I would read here ^{11u} Adad.—**50**, 1 xišu is explained by Jensen, *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), pp. 361, 362 as “Laube, Baldachin.”—14: Does pexû, Piel puxxû (ša sinništi) really mean “to open”? As a rule it is explained as “to close.” Besides this we must read here not puxxû, but puxxu ($\sqrt{\text{𐤠𐤍𐤕}}$), which Delitzsch, *Hwb.*, p. 516, explains as: “wahrscheinlich ein Weib vergewaltigen.” Another view is presented in *CD.*, p. 799, col. 2. II 38 f 6 reads dalû ša-pil-ti, not ša ša-pil-ti. The author’s explanation of this passage: “draw water (seed) from the womb, viz., cause conception” is not quite transparent.—**51**, Speaking of the Bal-meanings, the author says, l. 7: “Finally we have bal =

'cross over,' 'break a way across' = ebêru, from which oddly enough we have turgumannu 'interpreter,' one who over-sets(!)." Is turgumannu then derived from eberu?! The reviewer assumes that Prince's derivation is based only on the idea underlying ebêru —balaggu, "cry of woe" (also **87**, below). But what about Jensen, *KB.*, Vol. VI (1) 443, 520 and Aram. **𐎶𐎵𐎶**, "a kettle-drum?" —**52**, 8/9 Why takšîru, "decision," when tagšîru, "strength" (✓gašaru) suits so much better?—17 read V 39 (not 38) c 21.—Against the interpretation of banda as "strong," advocated also by Jastrow, *Religion*, Vol. I, p. 89 see Meissner, *Berl. Philol. Wochenschrift*, 1905, col. 1442.—l. 3 from below, read 1507 not 1537; xabzabbu is usually read kirçappu.—**54**, No. 4. Does Prince mean to say that bitrû is a derivative of barâru, "to shine," because both have the same ideograms? Were the coiners of the hodge-podge Sumerian good enough philologists for us to accept their etymological vagaries? We naturally assume that the author considers it a pun. Burru, on the other hand, is more likely a derivative from barâru, than a Sumerian loan word.—**55**, **56**, Unless barbaru, leopard (Jensen), or tiger (Zimmern) is borrowed from the Sumerian it has no place in this list.—**56**, 2 Bar(?)—gal=par—zi—lu, V 30 a—b 51, Brûnnow 1924, is mentioned together with kaspu, xurâçu, çarpu, anaku (? , lead) and is, undoubtedly, simply an unusual spelling of parzillu. Prince says: In R. 8 (= Reisner, *Hymnen*, 8) this combination = "shorn, said of sheep." But does this combination in R. 8 justify its application to V 30 a—b 51? To be sure, we have LU(=UDU) maš(s, bar?)—gal—lum = ŠU (*i. e.*, mašgallu) = lax(ud?)—ri; see Pinches, *PSBA.*, 1896, p. 251.—10 ka—bu—u, II 38 g—h 27 is merely a defective spelling for qabû, not a "pun on qabû." —15. II 57 b 14 read ^{il}at A—a (not Malik) ša ku—ni—e.—16 For baçit see also *CD.*, p. 818 s. v. pêçû.—**57**, **58**. I doubt whether the author's interpretation of bi—dar(ib)—ru—u as "joy" will be accepted by most assyriologists. See *CD.*, 146 and compare perhaps T. A. (Berlin) 18 rev. 11, 12 one bi—ib—ru kaspi: some ornament of silver.—**59**, 3 The reading of billudû has years ago been determined by Sp II 265 a, no. xiii, 3. bi—il—lu—di—e i—li (see *CD.*, p. 355, col. 2).—3 (end). I can scarcely agree to the explanation of ni—pi—'i eqli, II 11 e—f 73 = Haupt, *ASKT.*, p. 53. It is followed by BIR=çi—ib(p)—tu, "wealth, property." See also *CD.*, p. 634, col. 2. K 4216 rev. we have

(šam) ni-bi-'i eqli followed by (šam) inib eqli.—**61**, 22 On eššêpu see *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), p. 538; Hommel in Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 214 = "owl."—**62**, 16 ff. From šaqû, we would naturally expect a form šuqîtu, not šuqtû.¹⁶—**65** (end). On xardatu, V 36 *d-f* 40, 41, etc., see *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), p. 451 = "leckere Speise, Backwerk;" and nixlu = "Brot aus durchgesiebttem Mehl."—**66**, 1. The original meaning "hole" for xurxummatu is still to be seen in Br. Mus. 22446, 25, "when the oil xu-ur-xu-ma-tum id-di-a-am (*ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 225–27: "offene, runde Löcher"); see also K 9 obv. 27.—4. read qiddatu rather than kiddatu.—6. nixatpûtum is from xatâpu.—7. nixlu, nuxxulu, see above, under xardatu.—14 ff. šêrû and the three šilû are very questionable; see *CD.*, pp. 1036, col. 2 and 1109 col. 2.—17–8. I had thought that šûtuqu and šutêtuqu meant "advanced," *i. e.*, "renowned, magnificent," or the like. Does Prince's interpretation, "brought down," suit, *e. g.*, K 11152, 1 where Ištar is called in-nin-na-at ilâni šu-tu-ga-at be-li-e-ti. Of course, the author himself is not quite convinced of the correctness of his interpretation.

D, pp. 67–92.

68, 12. II 26 *c-d* 51 is usually read našû ša al-mat (Prince: lat)-ti.—14. I wonder whether the meaning "snare" for pitnu can be established; and if so, what would be the pitnu gal-la-bi, etc.?—15. ša-xa-tu is explained by Thompson, *Devils*, Vol. II, p. 172 as "vicinity."—27 Da-ab. The reference (Brünnow) 10693 is to V 41 *a-b* 62; accordingly change the statement in l. 3 of this section.—**69**, 7 naqâru ša elippi, II 26 No. 1 (add.) *c-f* 8 is, of course, a gloss to IV² 22 *a* 31, 32 (end) where with Thompson read i-na[-qar!]; see *Brit. Texts*, Pt. XVII, pl. 25, ll. 32, 33.—**70**, 1. For dakkanni see also *CD.*, p. 1158 col. 1 (where read tak-kan); tak-kan is the gloss to the ideogram consisting of K I (=place?) + manzazu, S^b 267 (gi-iš-gal); *CD.*, p. 562, cols. 1, 2. Now in K 3449 *a*, rev. 9, we find u-kin-ma gi-is-gal-la-ša, translated by Jensen, *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), p. 33; 350: "dann bestimmte er dessen (*i. e.*, of the ^{kakkab} qašta) Platz." In very similar connection we find *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), p. 30, ll. 1 and 8 ubaššim man-za-za; man-za-az ^{ilû} Bêl u ^{ilû} Ê-a u-k[i]n

¹⁶ The author writes to me on this point: "Yet šuqtû *might* be an unusual form with long vowel at the end."

it-ti-šu. We also find giš (or gis? *Hwb.*, p. 343, col. 1) - gal, lu = ku-us-su-u, which, perhaps, would indicate a mistake on the part of the scribe in K 3449 of *is* for *iš*. To this gišgal(lu) may perhaps also belong K 1014 obv., l. 2 (end) = Harper, *BAL.*, 457, where bit-gišgal-lu corresponds to bit danini in l. 1. And what about IV² 6, col. vi, ll. 15, 16, where instead of the usual reading amēlu šu-u we could read amēlu gišgallu-u? Now, what might be the meaning of gisgallu? I believe that the gloss tak-kan gives us the clue for it. For, instead of tak-kan, I would read par-kan (against my own *Dictionary*, p. 1158, col. 1) and connect it with parkannu-“bolt,” a word occurring in Zimmern, *Šurpu*, viii, 59, and probably also in *KB.*, Vol. VI (1), p. 66, col. 3, l. 29. The gloss par-kan is, of course, purely Semitic from פָּרַק; and, if so, this section belongs not into this *Lexicon*.—**71**, 7 (from below). I doubt very much whether litû (and its synonym) sa-la-tum mean “offspring.”—**72**, 19 read Muss-Arnolt, 640 (not 440) *b*.—**74**. My early statement concerning akû and di-el-lu, *CD.*, p. 33, col. 1, is, of course, untenable. See *e. g.*, p. 359 *s. v.* t̄(t)arkullu (so read for Prince’s dimgullu) and further in my supplemental volume.¹⁷—**76**, 3/4 kiççu (kîsu?) in kis(ç) libbi according to Kûchler, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der assyrisch-babyl. Medizin*, p. 65, means: “Leibschneiden,” probably “colic,” while Thompson, *Devils*, Vol. II, p. 37, explains it as “heartache.”—14 narâbu probably “to break.”—**78**, 17 read *JAOS.* (not *AJSL*), XXIV, 127.—**78**, 22, 23. Under article sisitu, *CD.*, p. 775, col. 2, I stated: “KB VI (1), 364 ikkillu, Geschrei oder Geheul;” thus making Jensen responsible for this interpretation, who, I assume, considered sisitum a variant to šisitum (i/šasû) and ši-ki-tum from šaqû, “be high” (also said of the voice), *i. e.*, “high pitch” (of voice). P. 1100, col. 1 of *CD.*, on the other hand, I state that šiqîtum means probably “irrigation.” The sisitu of K 2148, col. iii 29 (see Thompson, *Devils*, Vol. II, p. 153) must, of course, mean something else.—**80**, 7 (from below). Sb 337 is perhaps rather šapçu (not šabçu) = “arrogant, haughty, fiery of temperament” (!)—**81**, 5 (from below), read of course niqilpû (!) and see *CD.*, pp. 913, 914, נִיִּלְפֻּ.

¹⁷ I beg leave to state, in this connection, that in my supplemental volume, comprising some 600 pages in print, at least one-third will be given to the revision of the letter **N** inasmuch as this letter calls for more corrections than the remainder of the alphabet, and because more new material has been collected for its reconstruction than for the other letters.

6. nibiru scarcely "some part of a ship," but = "a ferry boat," the crossing in which was always more or less dangerous.—**82**, 1/2, šu-tuq-qu, preceded by e-li, with same ideogram; see Meissner, *Supplement*, p. 99, col. 2, who quotes **83**, 11–18, 1332 IV 7 DIR=ša-ta-qu.—**83**, 5 Zimmern, *ZDMG.*, Vol. LVIII, p. 952, proposes to read 𐎶axâdu.—kamârum ša šuribu indicates that kamâru in the meaning of "throw, strike down," is used of the šuribu; qanâqu ša ša-bi-e, says that qanâqu is also used in the meaning of šabû (see *CD.*, p. 999, col. 2, end).—**84**, 4 (from below) nam-qu. *ZA.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 193, states that *nam* has also the value *d(t)um*, thus read dum-qu.—**85**, 15 elepu ša iči scarcely means "join together, said of wood," but rather "to grow, said of wood."—**86**, 4 temêru is a verb rather than a noun.—12. Against reading mûlû (mu-lu) ša rêši, see Brünnow, 11244, who quotes Delitzsch in Zimmern, *Busspsalmen*, p. 82 *rm* 1.—**87**, 25. nabâçu is of course only a by-form to napâçu.—29. tarâku ša qinnazi, "tear a fetter in two," *Hwb.*, p. 714 (! not 615). I doubt this very much. tarâku means also "beat, strike;" and tarâku ša qî-na-zi, V 19 *c-d* 27 = "beat with a whip;" it is followed by ma-xa-çu (!). See also Jensen, *KB.*, Vol. VI (1) p. 450; while Thompson, *Devils*, Vol. I, p. 136, 77: "hold back some animal with a halter."—qinâzu, by the way, is explained in V 47 *a* 61 by ⁽¹⁹⁾d(t)ax-ri. Instead of *-ri*, I assume *-xu*, a mistake very easily explained, and read is(ç)daxxu, connecting it with išdaxxu, the *s* instead of *š* perhaps on account of the following dental. Now in Nimrod-Epic, Tablet VI, l. 54, we read iš-dax-xa ziq-ti u dir-ra-ta tal-ti-meš-šu; and in V 32 *a-b* 47, we have man-na-su=il (>iš!)-dax-xu, followed by tam-ša-ru=dir-ra-tum, evidently all synonyms; thus qinâzu=dirratum, "whip."—**88**, 9. The explanation of çumbu, S^c 299="finger," is very good and will no doubt be accepted generally.

E, pp. 92–109

The interpretation of the ideogram for bamātu (**95**, 17, 18) is most acceptable; as well as that of ša-a-mu, V 39 *e-f* 70 (**98**, 7–8).—**98**, 11. The gloss in II 39 *e* 7 clearly and distinctly reads e-ba not e-la.—17. There is no proof that il-mi in V 22 *d* 36 is Sumerian IL-MI.—**101**, 8 šapçu is "might, power, highness;" šipçu "potentate, prince, ruler;" also used as an adjective:

"proud, haughty."—**102**, 24ff. Fossey, *Contribution*, pp. 90, 91, does not mention **ENGUR** = **apsû** (= *Brit. Texts*, Vol. XII, pl. 26).—**104**, 5, read 5383 not 15383. The **erešu** treated there is, undoubtedly, a noun not a verb.—For **armannu**, Brünnow, 5403, the author should not have referred to my article (^{sam}) **armannu** "carrot," but to the one preceding it: **armannu**, "sweet odor, incense, perfume." On the ideogram see now Johns in *PSBA.*, 1905, p. 35.—24. **taqribtu**, "lamentation," so Prince following Brünnow, 11618; read **takkaltu** (see *CD.*, p. 1157, col. 1).—**109**, 20. Where does **xadādu**, "be strong," occur?

This review had been in type for some days when the writer received a copy of the *Revue sémitique*, April, 1906, containing, on pp. 184, 185, the learned editor's drastic criticism of Prince's work, in which he gives expression to his annoyance of the author's manner of setting forth what is practically a new theory regarding the Sumerian problem. Perhaps the chief cause of offense to the distinguished French scholar is Prince's unfortunate use of the term "the constantly decreasing Halévyan school of Jewish Chauvinism," on p. iii of his preface.¹⁸ Professor Prince has assured the reviewer that he merely meant by this expression "a mistaken sense of Jewish patriotism" which, he believes, has been the main spirit instigating the Halévyan idea that in Sumerian we have only a jargon based on Semitic ideas and invented only by Semites for ritual purposes. In answer to Halévy's objections to the table of phonetics, pp. x *sqq.*, it may be pointed out that every one of the sound-changes therein indicated has a parallel in some existing language. Halévy, for instance, rejects the equations: $B = G$ and $B = M$, yet in Yoruba there is a common sound sometimes represented by *gb* which is neither a *b* nor a hard *g*, but wavers between them both. That B can be $= M$ is seen in the Arabic dialectic pronunciation *Maalbek* for *Baalbek*. Furthermore, the interchange of *n* and a sibilant (Sum. $\check{s} = n$) occurs commonly between the Chinese dialects and has been duly noticed by Prince on p. xii. In short,

¹⁸ We can easily understand the feeling of provocation on the part of the venerable Nestor of Semitic studies in France at this more than unfortunate expression of Prince's; and we regret its occurrence all the more because Professor Halévy has always been most kindly disposed toward the reviewer's publications along Assyriological lines. See *Rev. sémit.*, Vols. III (1895) pp. 91, 92; XIV (1906), pp. 190, 191.

Prince's idea of Sumerian is really a connecting link between the extreme idea of the Halévyan school and the extreme idea of the opposing Sumerist school; *i.e.*, our author believes that the system was, originally, a language, but has been corrupted unconsciously by centuries of accretion into what is now little more than a Semitized idiom, the non-Semitic foundations of which, however, are still visible through the more or less opaque veil of Semitic influences in which they are shrouded.